Multiculturalism and Multicultural Education Approaches to Indigenous People's Education in Taiwan

Taiwan has cast multicultural policies as a remedy for inequalities and injustices its 16 Indigenous groups face. Such policies aim to revive Indigenous languages and cultures and create a more welcoming and inclusive environment in schools. Despite the fact that Indigenous people are expected to be primary beneficiaries of these policies, not much is known about how they have affected Indigenous students and communities, if at all. Relying on in-depth semi-structured interviews with 16 Indigenous participants, this paper explores whether the policies have accomplished or are on the way to accomplishing the goals set, as seen by Indigenous people. The findings show that the multicultural approach to education is still informed by assimilationist logic that expects Indigenous people to adjust to the culture and orientations of the dominant group, and as such, does not redress the existing injustices and inequalities.

Character count: 54,032

Introduction

Since 1624 the Indigenous people on the island that is now known as Taiwan saw the establishment of colonial settlements on their land from diverse outside powers ranging from European (Portuguese, Dutch, and Spanish) to Asian (Chinese and Japanese). During this period, Indigenous groups went through forceful relocation, military subjugation, and harsh assimilationist policies that intended to 'civilize' them (Cauquelin, 2011; Pawan, 2004). Enforcement of a new type of education was viewed as the primary force to rid Indigenous people of their 'savagery' by 'civilizing' them into the 'superior' identity, culture, language, and ethics of the new rulers (Teng, 2004). The 'civilizing' methods included uprooting of Austronesian cultures, languages, and identities of the Indigenous people and replacing them with those of the dominant, ruling group (Morris, 2007; Simon, 2002).

The process of 'civilization' through assimilation intensified during the Japanese colonial rule (1895-1945) and martial law under the Chinese Nationalist Party (1949-1987). Assimilation has led to gradual destruction of Indigenous lifestyles, traditional

structures, and communities, and erosion of Indigenous languages, knowledge systems, identities, and cultures (Hsieh, 2006; Su, 2006). It has also pushed Indigenous people from the place of being the masters of the island and their own fate to a minority comprising only 2.39% of the population and having no control over their own development or that of society's political, social, and economic domains (see Chi, 2012; International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA), 2019). Centuries of domination and subjugation have brought economic and social marginalization and fragmentation to Indigenous communities and created a stereotyped image of an indolent, addictive, and illiterate 'Other' leading to discrimination against and low self-esteem and self-respect among Indigenous people (Chen & Young, 2015; Yen, 2009).

As martial law was repealed in 1987, Taiwan started transition from authoritarianism and repression of human and Indigenous rights and freedoms to democratization and Taiwanization/localization of development (Cauquelin, 2011; Law, 2002). Two of the features of this transition were re-discovery of ethnic and linguistic diversity of the island to establish a locally-rooted identity and culture for a cohesive and harmonious nation-building, and removal of injustices that laid barriers to Indigenous people's academic and socio-economic advancement. To aid this transitional process, 'multicultural Taiwan' was chosen as the national identity and strategy to work towards (Wang, 2004), and multicultural education – as a remedy to the inequalities and injustices Indigenous people have been experiencing in academic settings and beyond. This shift to multiculturalism was sustained by the development and implementation of new educational policies and standards including the *Indigenous Education Act* that was introduced in 1998 to improve Indigenous people's experiences and outcomes in mainstream educational institutions (Nesterova, 2019).

Based on a qualitative study across Taiwan's regions, this paper discusses whether multiculturalism in its current conceptualization and implementation in Taiwan has been responding to the complex and multifaceted matters experienced by the most disadvantaged group in the society – Indigenous people. The paper starts by introducing Taiwan's Indigenous people, their geographical, social, and cultural make-up and moves to explore the conceptions of Taiwan's multiculturalism(s) promoted by the two parties that have governed Taiwan since 1987 – Kuomintang/the Chinese Nationalist Party (henceforth, KMT) and the Democratic Progressive Party (henceforth, DPP) and their implementation in mainstream education system. After that, it presents Indigenous voices that examine and reflect on these multicultural ideas, polices, and practices to determine how effectively (or not) they work towards the set goals of revival of Indigenous identities and cultures and addressing injustices and inequalities Indigenous people face. The paper concludes by highlighting implications for multicultural education for Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Taiwan and beyond.

Indigenous people of Taiwan

As a multi-lingual and multi-cultural society, Taiwan hosts such major ethnic groups as Han Chinese (divided into Hakka, Waisheng or mainland Chinese, and Minnan) and the Indigenous people. While the Han Chinese settlers started moving to Taiwan in the 17th centuries, the exact date of Indigenous people's settlement on the island is not known. Nevertheless, archaeological records show that already in 300 AD Austronesians sailed from Taiwan to the Philippines and other parts of the world, influencing languages and cultures of the Maori, Indonesians, Hawaiians, and others (Coca, 2013).

The Indigenous people are further divided into 16 officially recognized groups and at least 9 groups referred to as *ping pu* who are seeking state-level recognition. The recognized groups comprise approximately 565,043 people, or 2.39% of the population of the island (IWGIA, 2019). While they all belong to the Austronesian family and have a shared history of colonization and assimilation, they differ in size, inhabit different areas across the island, and exhibit differences in their socio-cultural organization (see Table 1). After centuries of colonization by outside powers, the main concerns the Indigenous people grapple with include disappearing cultures and languages, low socio-economic status, and limited political and economic influence (IWGIA, 2019).

Table 1. Recognized Indigenous Groups: Demographics, Locations, Characteristics

№	Name	Population	Location	Characteristics
1	Amis	177,000	Hualien and Taitung	Matrilineal system of social organization: female leadership of the private sphere (including property ownership), male leadership of the public sphere (laws, tribal politics, and others).
2	Paiwan	86,000	Sandimen and Taitung	The chief should be of the noble class. The chief acts as the leader in politics, military, and religion.
3	Atayal	81,000	New Taipei, Hualien, Hsinchu, Nantou	Facial tattoos are a long-standing tradition. Ancestral worship rituals are the key social/religious activity. Red clothes are favored as it represents blood that drives evil spirits away.
4	Bunun	50,000	Nantou, Kaohsiung, Eastern Taiwan	Patriarchal social structure; family members may include non-family blood relation; schedule their ceremonies according to millet planting, weeding, and harvest.
5	Truku	24,000	Taroko Gorge	Were at the forefront fighting the Japanese invasion; still keep their traditional technique of shaman sorcery and worship ancestors in special ceremonies every year.

6	Puyuma	11,000	Taitung	Divided into 8 sub-tribes that have different mythology about their creation; have 2 traditional systems of social organization: 1. family system with inheritance by the eldest daughter, and 2. organized by the different ages of men.
7	Rukai	11,600	Taitung and Wutai	Traditional social structure is comprised of commoners and nobles; with the latter have more economic and land privileged; commoners can be elevated to nobility through leadership and harvest production.
8	Sediq	10,000	Nantou	Traditional religion is based on 'utux', which means 'ancestral spirits'. Disrespecting utux brings disaster and misfortune. The group has the mosy conscious living, worships Sisin, the sacred bird, and makes decisions based on the sound the bord makes.
9	Tsou	6,500	Alishan	Very strict patriarchal structure; the social and political organization includes small and large well-organized clans; all decisions are made by men. Major ceremonies include war ritual and ancestral spirit worship.
10	Saisiyat	5,300	Hsinchu and Miaoli	Patriarchal structure of the tribe with women having no authority and inheritance rights for men only; consists of a number of sub-tribes that have equal status in relation to each other.
11	Dao	3,500	Orchid Island	Live offshore, isolated from the other groups, as a result, culture is relatively intact; social affairs are run by male heads of households and community's fishing groups. Famous for traditional boats, female hair dances.
12	Kavalan	1,100	Hualien and Yilan	The group believes that each living and non-living creature has its own spirit; has special offering ceremony and healing ceremony performed by a female shaman.

13	Thao	648	Sun Moon Lake	Patriarchal society; tribal chief, the position is inherited by the eldest son, is the main decision maker. The group was strongly influenced by the Chinese, but still holds to its traditions, one of them is having a basket with ancestor spirit at home.
14	Kanakanavu	520	Kaohsiung	Patrilineal society; has ceremonies to express gratitude for millet that is part of their daily diet and to the river for fish and other resources.
15	Hlaaula	400	Kaohsiung	Currently 3 main communities that are led by individual hereditary leaders and an assembly of elders and chiefs that make decisions about public affairs.
16	Sakizaya	335	Hualien (among Amis people)	Matrilineal system, a man moves to his wife's house after marriage. Fishing and hunting are traditional ways of life. 'Miamaivaki' is the ceremony in which elders give regards to young group members.

Multicultural education

In this work, multicultural education is defined as "education that aims to respond to the presence of diversity and inequality in society" (Jackson, 2014a, p. 12). It does so by defining the overall approach to education that further influences curriculum development and other related practices. Jackson (2014a) differentiates between assimilationist and pluralist approaches to multiculturalism. Assimilationist approach sees differences between groups as deficiencies and barriers to equality and social progress. Minority groups are expected to abandon their cultural practices and orientations and adjust to those of the dominant group. Education then plays a role of the initiator of these disadvantaged groups into the values, mannerism, and practices of the broader society.

Jackson (2014a) contrasts assimilationism with pluralist approach which she divides into multiculturalism and critical multiculturalism. The former views cultural and social difference as good and worthy of public recognition and toleration and posits that dismissing diverse cultural representations and references harm minorities, their self-esteem and identity. The latter rejects the status quo that keeps minorities in an inferior and disadvantaged position and calls it unjust and unethical. Education through multicultural lens looks to preserve diverse cultures and teach their members to live peacefully together, whereas critical multicultural education also works to dismantle oppressive structures that disadvantage and marginalize minority groups.

In school contexts, critical multiculturalism does so by self-consciously and critically assessing, challenging, and rejecting racism, discrimination, and unequal power dynamics in policies and practices and their negative impact on marginalized and vulnerable students (Nieto, 2005). Schools that adopt critical multiculturalism as its philosophy, first, affirm pluralism represented by their staff, students, and their communities and incorporate diverse knowledges, histories, and value systems into a teaching-learning paradigm in an ethical and responsible manner (see May, 1999; Nieto, 2000). Second, they emphasize a proactive and conscious engagement with issues of social justice to transform "the diverse histories, cultural narratives, representations, and institutions that produce racism and other forms of discrimination" (Giroux, 1995, p. 328) and construct just, equitable, "culturally responsive and responsible practice[s]" (Ukpokodu, 2003, p. 19).

As far as multicultural curriculum is concerned, Banks (1989) proposes four types. Contributions type keeps curriculum structure and goals unchanged while focusing on integrating certain ethnic and cultural references such as ethnic heroes, food, music, and dance on specific days. This approach is the easiest for teachers to

adopt, but it teaches nothing about ethnic groups and tends to "gloss over important concepts and issues related to the victimization and oppression of ethnic groups and their struggles against racism and for power" (Banks, 1989, p. 17).

Additive type adds to the existing curriculum some selected literature, units or courses that discuss topics related to ethnic and cultural diversity issues. While there is a certain addition in this type, no fundamental changes are made in the curriculum, and content is chosen by the dominant group to comply with criteria and perspectives of the mainstream society. This approach fails to equip students with skills to see their society from differing perspectives and to understand connections between histories and cultures of diverse groups. As Ladson-Billings (2003) explains, this approach leaves the "monocultural, exclusive narrative" unchallenged (p. 9).

Transformation type sets to change basic assumptions in the curriculum. Similar to critical multiculturalism, it integrates diverse concepts, problems, perspectives, and references to make students look at different issues and events from differing worldviews and points of view. Curriculum undergoes fundamental changes to integrate a variety of (divergent) perspectives, meanings, and content to fully understand the complexity of their society. Finally, decision-making and social action type is an enhanced transformation type as it also aims to equip students with such skills as research skills, political efficacy, critical thinking, and critical decision-making and action.

Multicultural education and Indigenous people in Taiwan

Despite being the authoritarian ruler that established martial law in 1949, the KMT was the party that – though under immense pressure – initiated and carried through the transition to democracy, remaining the principal power until 2000 when Chen Shui-bian

of the DPP became the president of Taiwan (Caldwell, 2018). KMT won presidential elections in 2008 and remained in power until 2016 when another DPP's choice, a woman politician with Indigenous ancestry, Tsai Ing-wen was elected president. It is these two parties' politics that have been shaping multiculturalism and multicultural education that affected Indigenous education in Taiwan in the democratic period: KMT from 1987 to 2000 and from 2008 to 2016 and DPP from 2000 to 2008 and from 2016 until now.

For both parties, multiculturalism acted as a way to address two acute matters facing the society in transition to democracy. One was formation of a new identity of Taiwan's citizens and the other – finding remedies for inequalities and injustices experienced by Indigenous and other minority groups (Cheng, 2004; Ku, 2012). If the views on identity formation have seen certain fundamental differences between the parties due to their political and geopolitical directions (especially relationships and ties with Mainland China), their approaches to addressing inequalities Indigenous groups experience have been much the same.

KMT multiculturalism started as a response to the need to deconstruct the coercively imposed uniform and nationalist Chinese identity and build a new identity to reflect the society's multicultural heritage and liberal democratic values in post-authoritarian era (Jackson, 2014b). The KMT model of multiculturalism is hierarchal as it places the dominant Chinese culture on top followed by all the other island's minority cultures (e.g., Indigenous, Hakka). This approach was best described by the former president Lee Teng Hui of the KMT party who, talking about the Indigenous population of Taiwan, said that they "have to 'melt' into Taiwanese society" without which they "cannot exist" (Wang, 2004, p. 307).

Critics of KMT multiculturalism suggest that highlighting Indigenous and minority cultures as part of multicultural Taiwan and its multicultural education was a way to form a new nationalism (Wang, 2004) and to pacify "an unrestful Taiwan population" (Mao, 1997, p. 404). Indigenous cultures were not viewed as worthy to survive in their entirety and standing on their own, without integration into the dominant Chinese structure. Efforts were therefore directed at preserving the parts of it and addressing the needs of Indigenous people that could be tolerated in the mainstream sinocentric society and education (Mao, 1997).

KMT has taken a series of actions to enact their model of multicultural Taiwan. The first action was the 1992 amendment of the Constitution to pledge assistance to Indigenous cultural and language revival. The amendment intended to allocate funding and other support to promote and teach Indigenous languages and cultures and conduct research on Indigenous issues. As Tsao (1997) shows, only a small number of intended activities were even started or completed, and most of them were too impractical, small-scale, and in some cases too late to be able to address the urgent issues Indigenous communities faced (e.g., language and knowledge loss and structural injustices).

In 1996 the Commission on Education Reform implemented a new educational policy referred to as 'dual cultural identities' attempting to aid the revival of Indigenous identities (Huang, 2007). The policy failed to produce positive results as Indigenous children were still educated in predominantly Chinese environment. Such education distressed their Indigenous identities and mother tongue skills as Mandarin was used as the only language of instruction while Indigenous languages were labelled as "informal, useless, playful, traditional and backward" (Huang, 2007, p. 16). The consequence of this treatment of Indigenous languages was their continued destruction: the 2004 survey

showed that only 9% of Indigenous children could speak their respective Indigenous mother tongues (Pawan, 2004). Despite that, KMT-led multicultural reforms in 1990s, including that of the introduction of the *Twelve Education Reform Mandates* in 1998 led to a more integrated multicultural curriculum that focused on diversity, local issues, respect and protection of diverse cultures, and prevention of prejudice and discrimination (Jackson, 2014b).

Another key measure taken by KMT in support of Indigenous development, for example, includes recognizing Indigenous groups as Indigenous or *yuan-chu-min* 原住民族 in Chinese ("original people's group") through amendments in the Constitution in 1994 (Kingsbury, 1998). This move gave them – at least on paper – powers and rights to control their development and receive support to carry required changes through. Introduction of the *Education Act for Indigenous Peoples* in 1998 (amended in 2015) was another positive development that gave Indigenous communities the right to establish their own educational spaces and structures, promote Indigenous languages, history, and culture in mainstream institutions, and ensure that discrimination, racism, and misrepresentation are addressed. Initiatives that emerged ensured access for Indigenous children to quality schools (Cheng, 2004) and additional points for passing the National Proficiency Test of Aboriginal Languages (PTAL) to be admitted to tertiary institutions (Rudolph, 2016). Yet, the schools that serve Indigenous students, still tend to lack adequate funding, resources, facilities, and qualified teachers (Chou, 2005; Nesterova, 2019).

DPP's need for multiculturalism, especially with the focus on legitimizing Indigenous identities, stemmed from the political necessity to ensure sovereignty from Mainland China (Ku, 2012). As a result, it has led to a slightly different model of

multiculturalism that prioritizes the so-called localized Taiwanese culture followed in the hierarchy by Chinese and then global cultures (including Japanese, Western, and migrant workers from other Asian states). The Taiwanese culture in this case is a merger of diverse cultures that developed on the island prior to martial law. It thus incorporates the cultures of Hoklo and Hakka people (Chinese people who started settling in Taiwan in the 17th century) and those of Indigenous people that belong to the Austronesian family (Wang, 2004).

The DPP model was put forward by president Chen Shui-bian who envisioned a mosaic of cultures that would live peacefully with each other to create, what he called, a harmonious symphony (Wang, 2004). Despite the theoretical shift from a hierarchy to mosaic of cultures and a more substantial acknowledgement of Indigenous identities in shaping the local culture and identity, Chen's idea was hardly widely accepted. Indigenous cultures are still seen as comprising an insignificant part of the local Taiwanese culture (2.39% of the population as opposed to approximately 70% of the Hoklo people of Chinese ancestry) and as a consequence were in need to melt into the Taiwanese identity. Nevertheless, president Chen officially announced in 2001 that multiculturalism would be the national policy to help reaffirm democracy (Law, 2002) and identity of Taiwanese people (Mason, 2009). In relation to Indigenous people, in 1999 Chen's administration developed a "New Partnership" agreement to aid work on Indigenous autonomy and related powers (Chi, 2007). A positive development of this decision has been the change from treating the Indigenes as a monolithic and homogenous ethnic group to treating them as individual groups (Rudolph, 2016).

Apart from the concerns for the development of a new identity and revival of Indigenous cultures and languages, another urgent matter for KMT and DPP has been

academic underachievement of Indigenous students. In different periods it was determined by Taiwan-based studies that Indigenous children do not succeed academically in mainstream educational institutions due to their cultural differences from the mainstream (see Lee & Chen, 2014; S.-H. Chen, 2015; P. Chen, 2012; Huang, 2007). Indigenous cultural difference has been seen as cultural deficiency that prevented Indigenous children from adjusting to the learning environment and academic expectations of Taiwan's schooling.

The remedy that would correct such problematic experiences was found in multicultural education that was executed in educational institutions in the form of introduction of performative Indigenous cultures. Multicultural education then became restricted to what Taiwan's scholars refer to as "artsy" (Wang, 2014) and "touristy" (Chou, 2005) practices. Chi (2012, p. 3) pointed out that such practices manifest in "the celebration of distinct cultural expressions and performances." Such decisions are made due to the superficial understanding of multiculturalism (Fenelon & LeBeau, 2006), the needs of Indigenous people, and the stereotypical image of Indigenous groups as people who lead "carefree lives singing and dancing" (Gao, 2001).

Chou (2005) blamed this on ethnic and racial blindness of Taiwan's multicultural policies. The studies conducted by Cheng (2004) and Yen (2009) also determined that it is racist attitudes of non-Indigenous teachers who lack knowledge about Indigenous people and skills to engage with them and instead, stereotype and discriminate against Indigenous people, their cultures and identities. The danger is not only that such unhealthy environment in schools leads to lack of motivation to study on behalf of Indigenous children. This focus on artistic expression of Indigenous groups, lack of accurate and comprehensive representation of them in the classroom, and

unwillingness to address racism perpetuate stereotypes and prejudices about Indigenous people and their lifestyles (Su, 2006; 2007) and diminish the complexity and intersectionality of their identities (Gorski, 2016) to dance, song, and 'costume'.

The focus on artistic and touristy components of Indigenous cultures can be a consequence not purely of misunderstanding of multiculturalism, but of intentional pursuit of economic benefits from the 'exotic' cultures of Indigenous people. The Austronesian identity of the Indigenes has been used as backdoor diplomacy to establish neo-liberal free trade contracts with countries with Austronesian population in the Pacific (Friedman, 2018) and to sign memorandums of understanding with Canada and Australia which certainly resulted in benefits of intercultural exchange between Indigenous people of Taiwan, Canada, and Australia (Munsterhjelm, 2002). Locally, the stereotypical identity of a joyous, dancing, and singing Indigene has been recreated to promote tourism within Taiwan and to showcase Indigenous people at national events (Munsterhjelm, 2002) to solidify a localized Taiwanese identity. To accomplish this, Indigenous people are expected to be more authentic than authentic to be attractive to the outsiders. This condition fractures Indigenous communities and hampers the development of strong Indigenous identities and cultures effectively forcing the Indigenes to focus on "local authenticity at the expense of other forms of legitimacy" (Friedman, 2018, p. 97).

It should be admitted that the KMT and DPP multicultural policies and practices have opened up possibilities of revival of Indigenous cultures and search for identities. As Jackson's (2014b) analysis of Taiwan's curriculum suggests, education *has* become less assimilationist and more multicultural. Nevertheless, neither parties have managed to respond to these needs in a more profound manner nor have they been able to address

more structural and complex matters hampering Indigenous development (Shih, 2010). The focus on Indigenous artistic performances alone conceals a more urgent need in developing Indigenous communities – the need to not only revive Indigenous worldviews, knowledge systems, and philosophies, but to address racial and socio-economic inequalities and injustices (St. Denis, 2011).

Materials and methods

This study is a part of a larger qualitative research project on the development of Indigenous education conducted in Taiwan. The qualitative research design was selected as the aim of the project was to understand the "phenomenon from the views of the participants" (Creswell, 2009, p. 16). Apart from that, a qualitative inquiry allowed to establish close contacts with the participants to develop trust and rapport which helped them to open up and be willing to let the researcher to come for any clarifications and additional information. The use of interviews also enabled more comprehensive discussions about the matter under study as the participants spent extended periods of time with the researcher.

The data were collected during a fieldwork across Taiwan in August 2016. Sixteen Indigenous people participated in in-depth semi-structured interviews evaluating and reflecting on the education policies implemented during 1990s and 2000s. The participants included six Taiwan's Indigenous leaders (IL) and ten professors (P) all of whom work to assist Indigenous communities' development and promotion of Indigenous cultures, knowledge, and education (see Table 2). They came from diverse Indigenous groups (e.g., Amis, Bunun, Puyuma, Paiwan, and others) in which they were considered as respected and trusted leaders by their people. All participants were all above the age of 35 to ensure that in their interviews they could

rely on their substantial experience (at least 10 years) in Indigenous affairs and understanding of the complexities and factors of Indigenous development within the local and global contexts.

Table 2. Profiles of interview participants

Participant	Location	Primary Fields of Expertise
P1	Taichung	Professor: Indigenous education, Indigenous language, Indigenous culture
P2	Taitung	Professor: Indigenous and minority languages and education, multiculturalism
P3	Hualien	Professor: Indigenous rights, justice, land rights, political science and law
P4	Tainan	Professor: Indigenous knowledge, Higher Education
P5	Taitung	Professor: Indigenous rural education, cultural revival
P6	Taichung	Professor: Justice, Indigenous rights, Indigenous economic development
P7	Taichung	Professor: Indigenous development, cultural revival
P8	Taitung	Professor: Indigenous language education, urban indigenous communities
P9	Hualien	Professor: Indigenous grassroots political movement, Indigenous education, Indigenous language
P10	Tainan	Professor: Indigenous education, Indigenous languages
IL1	Taichung	Indigenous education, cultural revival
IL2	Taitung	Indigenous rights, Indigenous governance, cooperation between and among groups
IL3	Taitung	Indigenous rights, cultural revival
IL4	Hualien	Indigenous rights, grassroots movement for education, language and cultural revival
IL5	Hualien	Rural indigenous development, environmental sustainability
IL6	Hualien	Immersion schools for indigenous children, rural development

As the participants live across Taiwan – from the western and more developed cities of Taichung and Tainan where Indigenous people were affected by colonization most to the eastern part of Hualien and Taitung where the mountains provided a barrier that kept the colonial powers away for a much longer period of time – the interviews took place in these four cities and counties. Each interview lasted from one hour to two hours and a half. The interviews were conducted in English except for one that required Chinese-English interpreters and two others that asked for an interpreter to be present in case they would have difficulty in expressing themselves. The interpreters were two Indigenous women with full proficiency in the languages of the study and accepted members in the Indigenous communities the participant came from. All the interviews were audio-recorded with the written consent of the participants after the aim of the study, its procedure, potential benefits and consequences had been discussed in detail. After that, each interview was transcribed verbatim in English, and in the case of the interviews conducted (partly or fully) in Chinese, Chinese and English transcriptions were done and cross-checked by another interpreter fluent in two languages.

To analyze the data, cross-sectional and case studies approach were used. The cross-sectional method consisted of identifying common themes, categories, and patterns and after that merging the participants' responses under them, comparing and contrasting their views and insights. Then, each participant's story was approached as an individual case to tell a distinct story or narrative about the topic of the study.

Results

Two distinctive policies

Discussing Taiwan's multicultural policies, all participants agreed that Indigenous people should not side with either of the two leading parties as no party prioritizes

Indigenous needs. Despite that, they all shared that if they compare how Indigenous people have been treated by KMT and DPP during the democratization period, they referred to KMT policies as "assimilationist" and "welfare colonialis[t]" whereas DPP is viewed as a more "localized" and "Indigenized" party capable of more profound multicultural reforms. As an Indigenous leader (#IL6) recounted:

> There is a very long history for the KMT as a ruling party. … their main policy - we can call it colonizing, assimilation. So, it is hardly you can hear during their regime that the so-called multiculturalism or even the respect Indigenous traditional culture and knowledge, the language… and revitalize it, it's very hard. But the more Indigenized and localized the party DPP, it is very ... On the contrary, they want to be with the Indigenous people, and they have to understand that they somehow have the same fate with the Indigenous people.

Inequality in resources and representation in education

Nevertheless, the participants were united in saying that the existing multicultural policies – whether they were issued by KMT or DPP – are not sufficient for creating a multicultural society. The reason is that the authorities and institutions do not pay due attention to the revival of Indigenous cultures, languages, and knowledge(s), strengthening of Indigenous identities, or dealing with academic underachievement, low socio-economic status, and discrimination against Indigenous people. This lack of real engagement with Indigenous issues on behalf of the authorities is a major concern Indigenous people have regarding their own development. As they shared, since the establishment of the quasi-ministerial Council of Indigenous Peoples (CIP) in 1996, the responsibility to manage Indigenous education has been placed on this institution that is often under-funded and lacks power similar to the Ministry of Education (MOE), for example. As a professor (#P5) explained:

> Even if they think they are doing multiculturalism. But I don't buy it. Because they don't really think about how this Indigenous peoples' education, to revitalize our language. They think that it's business of CIP, not the government. … And, actually, one of the problems related to Indigenous education is that MOE they take control of general education, and CIP need to

> deal with Indigenous education. Sometimes if you want to do something for Indigenous education, there is a problem with this two. MOE is higher status than CIP, they have more money.

Despite the responsibility being placed on CIP, the institution does not only have limited finances or power, it has no control over mainstream education the vast majority of Indigenous and non-Indigenous students attend. Schools are managed by MOE that determines the structure, content, pedagogy, and other academic matters. As it was noted by the participants, all the decisions are informed by the dominant Chinese conceptions of education and societal success, and this is also reflected in the educational approach and the teaching contents and pedagogy that are the same for Indigenous and non-Indigenous students. In terms of the multicultural educational approach, a professor (#P8) observed:

> There is something like culture plus approach. Where basically you have the mainstream culture and then you add on a few days, classes a week to learn about each local culture.

The culture plus approach also includes adding cultural events where Indigenous people are asked to wear traditional clothing and perform traditional songs and dances to parents of non-Indigenous students. Apart from being viewed as exploitative and superficial, the participants said that this approach to education, teaching, and content:

> … is not fair. You cannot teach every child the same thing, the same cultures, the same languages. Because children are from different background. How can you do that? We call that 'assimilationist policies' (#P1).

Languages and education

Language policy and language use are two other areas that shows the "failure" of the multicultural approach. Reflecting on the language policy, a professor (#P1) stated that:

> The government might say they are using the multiculturalism policy for Indigenous peoples, but I don't think so. They provided us with a language policy and language lessons in early childhood education. In pre-school it is one class once a week. It is lesser than learning English. English, I believe, it's

> two hours per week. You can see the difference. And the government will tell you, this is what I give you, at least this is something. But this is not enough.

It was explained by the others that each lesson of an Indigenous language lasts only 40 minutes, and it may not take place every week as such "insignificant classes" get cancelled in favour of math test or a sports event. Additionally, although it is a 40-minute class, there are only around 15 minutes of the actual language lesson because a teacher can sing or read something in an Indigenous language, but all explanations come in Mandarin. Such an arrangement makes it hard to master a language.

Another professor (#P7) shared:

> It doesn't matter where you go, Mandarin is everywhere. Chinese culture, conceptions are everywhere. And even at home we can't learn about our culture and our language, as our people don't speak this language.

The issue, however, is not only with the loss of Indigenous languages and related knowledge as there is no space to learn and practice them. What worries the participants is that education in Chinese environment with the Chinese language, culture, and knowledge system, makes it challenging for Indigenous students to find meaning, belonging, and identity in the education they receive thus complicating their adjustment to the system and understanding of the material. As one Indigenous leader (#IL6) explained, echoing the other participants, "… for Indigenous people, it is difficult to learn their system, we need to overcome these difficulties that come from language and culture."

Inequity of educational opportunity

As most of the participants expressed the difficulty stems from the policies being "simply not fair" as they do not have equal educational opportunity. By educational opportunity these participants do not mean educational access because access is ensured by law. What they focus on instead is a form of multiculturalism sensitive to Indigenous needs: one that acknowledges their languages, cultures, identities, traditions, histories, and lifestyles. As participants concluded, they are provided with equal access to good schools. The problem, however, is that many Indigenous students drop out of these schools that are not trained nor willing to deal with Indigeneity.

Unsatisfactory content of education

Dropping out of school and unsatisfactory academic achievements of those who finish schools are also a result of insensitive content of education which slows down their progress and/or makes the environment unbearable. The participants shared that the content represents Indigenous people as "barbarians" willing to assimilate to a civilized culture of the settlers. For this, textbooks use stories to promote a particular narrative. For example, a professor (#P1) stated that:

> The textbook doesn't talk about the contribution of Indigenous people. They talk only a little bit about Indigenous peoples. And they bring stereotypical image of Indigenous people.

All the participants agreed that the history of colonization of the island has been ignored. Instead, Chinese people are presented as pioneers on the quest to civilize barbarian and primitive Indigenous people. They said:

> They talk about colonialism in a positive way. They say pioneering of Indigenous land. They try to say that barbarians were civilized. They still say that. They still think that we are primitive (#P1).

As a result, the participants argued, children may be afraid to share that they are Indigenous as some non-Indigenous people "still would joke about that word 'barbarian'" (#IL4) and share degrading stories of Indigenous "savage cultures" (#P5). Such a view of Indigenous people as being uncivilized and barbarian, it was retorted, leads to discrimination and racist attacks and treatment by non-Indigenous people.

Learning about Indigeneity in schools

What is of concern is that education about Indigenous people is not part of the curriculum in Taiwan. This has created a situation when Indigenous people know everything about the dominant group and non-Indigenous people have no or limited knowledge about Indigenous people and their – in parts oppressive – history with the Chinese majority group. Very often such knowledge is based on stereotypes and misrepresentation which creates resentment on the part of Indigenous people. Some participants shared that "they [the dominant Chinese group] learn little about us" (#P2)

and “they don’t want to know anything” (#P7). The result, the Indigenous participants said, is that there is no understanding by non-Indigenous people of what changes are required to address the struggles of Indigenous people in the mainstream society and education system. Most of them reflected that the dominant group does not know about the reality Indigenous people live in and mostly sees them through a negative lens.

> They think we are not good people, we are inferior, and they have to help us. … They stigmatize us, and we stigmatize ourselves. It’s psychological, very negative influence (#IL6).

Such lack of knowledge and understanding by the dominant group is not viewed in society as problematic despite the fact that institutions, including the MOE, deal with Indigenous affairs with no comprehensive understanding of Indigenous contexts and needs. As it was mentioned by 15 participants, non-Indigenous institutions are unwilling to get to know and understand Indigenous people, their affairs and values, and, thus are not able to do much to help Indigenous communities. One professor (#P1) maintained that:

> MOE does have a unit that deals with Indigenous education. It is small. In that unit they don’t understand Indigenous education. That unit need to have more people who are familiar with Indigenous education, language, culture.

Colonization of Indigenous mind

Lack of knowledge about Indigenous cultures, affairs, and related matters among the dominant group representatives and institutions is not the only worry. The real problem, repeated by everyone in the study, is that the Indigenous mind is colonized and is overreliant on the dominant structures and mentality. An Indigenous leader (#IL6) put it neatly:

> We are double-blind. One blind for our knowledge, the other for theirs. We don’t have the opportunity, time, or space to learn our ways, ourselves.

Multicultural education, therefore, for them would mean not only the dominant society learning about Indigenous history and heritage as well as colonial legacy that has affected them. It should also include Indigenous people learning about themselves, recognizing and respecting their cultures, re-building and strengthening their identities, and reviving and maintaining their cultures, languages, and traditions.

Uniqueness of Indigeneity

In addition, it was emphasized throughout the interviews, multiculturalism in Taiwan cannot be developed with the benefit for Indigenous people if the "uniqueness and value of each group" (#IL3) is not recognized. In relation to education, the participants shared, this concerns the difference of mentalities, values, knowledges, languages, and identities Indigenous and non-Indigenous people have. Multiculturalism in the view of these participants should mean development of "each group in its own unique cultural way while developing together at the same time by working as a team" (#P4). This way, Indigenous participants believe, multicultural Taiwan will be possible.

Discussion

Multicultural approach

Looking at the construction of multiculturalism in Taiwan, we can see some progression of Taiwan's multicultural education in the past few decades. The dominant rhetoric has shifted from seeing the dominant Chinese culture as superior and those of Indigenous people as barbarian and uncivilized (assimilationism) to acknowledging the existence of Indigenous cultures and seeing their contribution, although restricted to certain expressions and monitored (and disciplined?) by the dominant group, as valuable (pluralism: multiculturalism).

The approach is, however, still mixed and informed more by assimilationism than multiculturalism. Taiwan's Indigenes are still expected to adjust to the culture and orientations of the dominant group when in the public sphere, not revive and expand their own, Indigenous cultural references. Their presence, cultures, and identities are tolerated and even praised by the wider society for their artistic performances that contribute to visible diversity, construction of counter-Mainland Chinese identity, and the economic domain through tourism.

Multicultural education policies aim to preserve Indigenous cultures allegedly to benefit Indigenous people. However, preservation concerns only some tolerable Indigenous characteristics such as dance, song, and costume for someone else's entertainment and monetary benefit while putting Indigenous cultures and identities in a box where they cannot develop, change, and adjust for fear of not being seen 'authentic'. That which does not fit within the boundaries of the dominant epistemology and ontology and which cannot therefore be tolerated should then be "domesticated" or "made similar," as Andreotti (2011) explains.

Another example that showcases assimilationism of Taiwan's multiculturalism is the establishment of a semi-efficient under-funded Indigenous government in the form of CIP that is charged with dealing with Indigenous issues that the dominant institutions (including MOE and mainstream schools) do not take on. This shows that Indigenous matters are pushed into its own domain that does not intersect or work substantially with the public domain that is led and shaped by the dominant group with little, if any, contribution by the Indigenes. As a result, multicultural policies that are expected to benefit Indigenous communities, have done little for them.

Another problematic side of Taiwan's multiculturalism is that multicultural education is not seen as substantial or genuine and can be argued to be done for the

wrong reasons. Unlike Jackson's conceptualization of multiculturalism that sees refusal to integrate minorities' cultural references into the majority culture as harming minority's self-esteem and identity, in Taiwan the reforms are enacted not to develop and strengthen Indigenous self-respect and identities but to pacify unrestful Indigenous population. This is well represented in what one of the participants shared discussing how the local government reacts to dissatisfaction of Indigenous people with the current reforms and policies. They say: "this is what I give you, at least this is something" (#P1).

One major reason for multicultural reforms not being sensitive or relevant for Indigenous groups' needs and interests is the colonized mentality. Such mentality – informed by the conceptions and cultural references of the Chinese group – shapes and determines the development of institutions, educational content, and pedagogy. As the system is believed by the Indigenes to be inflexible and unwilling to undergo substantial changes, not only full multiculturalism but also critical multiculturalism cannot be achieved: the status quo is maintained and there may be no awareness that it needs to be questioned. As a result, Indigenous people are kept in a disadvantaged and marginalized position and prevented from attaining justice and equality.

Multicultural curriculum

One of the outcomes of the assimilationist approach with some elements of multiculturalism used in Taiwan is that curriculum (including content, textbook, and pedagogy) adopts the contributions approach, as conceptualized by Banks (1989). In the context of Taiwan it is limited to Indigenous people receiving one 40-munite lesson of Indigenous culture and language per week and showcasing Indigenous performative culture to the dominant group during school extra-curricular events. This approach is not efficient for reviving Indigenous cultures and languages, engineering a culturally

sensitive and relevant environment for Indigenous students, or addressing racism and discrimination they may experience from non-Indigenous people. The approach simply adds a course on Indigenous cultures and languages for some Indigenous people and a performance to enjoy for non-Indigenous people. It does not introduce essential Indigenous-friendly modifications into the curriculum and does not add discussions on diversity and Indigenous issues the additive approach would.

The problematic aspect of this approach to multiculturalism is not only that students do not learn to see their society from the perspectives of its diverse members, their histories and cultures, as Banks (1989) suggests. What this approach does to Indigenous people is it makes education for them largely meaningless and not healthy for building and strengthening Indigenous identities and cultures. It also makes it hard for them to progress academically as learning environments are structured around concepts, language, history representation, knowledge system, and other essential dimensions of the dominant group at the expense of Indigenous philosophies, knowledge systems, views of history, contributions to the society, and other aspects that would make education for Indigenous people relevant, sensitive, and welcoming.

At the same time, Indigenous children can observe that the knowledge, cultures, orientations, and language that are favoured belong to the dominant group, making them feel that whatever Indigenous world has to offer is worthless and irrelevant. As Fenelon and LeBeau (2006, p. 28) put it, when schools promote truth and knowledge of the dominant group as it is *the only* truth and knowledge, they "render all other ways of life/thought/feelings/embodiment as invalid." Denying Indigenous world to enter mainstream schooling shows disrespect towards Indigenous belief systems, values, and contexts. This position – whether explicitly or implicitly – designs education strategies and policies that intend to assimilate Indigenous groups into the dominant culture.

Another concern for the curriculum is not only lack of cultural references and Indigenous knowledge(s) and philosophies, but limited representation and misrepresentation of Indigenous and Chinese groups in the curriculum. This representation is constructed and controlled by the dominant group that shapes the discourse on Indigenous people and issues and creates a particular image the Chinese group – and Indigenous people – have about the Indigenous world. As can be seen from the findings, the Indigenous discourse sees Indigenous cultures in a stereotypical and negative way which can reinforce the superiority of the dominant, Chinese group, and the need to assimilate Indigenous people.

Implications for Taiwan's multicultural education

Taiwan's multicultural education can be said to be a mix of assimilationism and elements of the multicultural stage of pluralism enacted in the education system through the contributions approach to multicultural curriculum reform. Based on the discussions with the Indigenous participants, it can be determined that such form of multiculturalism has not done and is not expected to do what the Indigenous people need for the revival of their communities. Positive and substantial changes can take place if multicultural policies adopt the approach of critical multiculturalism and the curriculum will be revised and modified to use decision-making and social action approach. After all, Zilliacus and colleagues (2017, p. 231) are right in saying that "narrow notions of what multicultural education is threaten the politically rooted movement for equity and social justice." The goals that are pursued by Indigenous people in Taiwan and elsewhere.

If adopted, critical multiculturalism approach can help enforce the rejection of the status quo in the society and call on various parties to work towards justice and

equity for Indigenous communities. The revised model of education in this case will work to teach all students whether they are Indigenous or not to acquire skills to see the complex relations between histories, legacy, and development to understand the struggles and needs of different populations. Such educational approach will also work to dismantle unjust and oppressive structures that marginalize, silence, fetishize, and stereotype some groups, their cultures, perspectives, worldviews, and identities. Banks' decision-making and social action approach can aid this process through major transformations in the curriculum, including textbooks and pedagogies used by teachers, and teacher education itself. One lesson of Indigenous culture and language for Indigenous students per week therefore should transform to the inclusion of Indigenous philosophies, views, perspectives, histories, and other orientations into all school subjects.

However, changes in content, although fundamental and substantial, may not be enough to achieve justice and equality. Apart from learning about the Indigenous Other, their contribution, and colonization of their lands and destruction of their cultures that led to the current low socio-economic status, non-Indigenous students need to unlearn bias and racist stereotypes about Indigenous communities and be proactive in the work towards Indigenous justice and equality. Critical multicultural education is one such way as it aims to transform the perceptions of and attitudes towards the Other and consciously work to construct a new world that is just and equitable for all. It therefore should become part of the revision of multicultural policies and curriculum in Taiwan.

References

Andreotti, V. (2011). *Actionable postcolonial theory in education*. New York, USA: Palgrave Macmillan.

Banks, J. A. (1989). Approaches to multicultural curriculum reform. *Trotter Review, 3*(3), 17–19.

Caldwell, E. (2018). Transitional justice legislation in Taiwan before and during the Tsai administration. *Washington International Law Journal, 27*(2).

Cauquelin, J. (2011). *The aborigines of Taiwan. The Puyuma: From headhunting to the modern world* (2nd ed.). London/New York: Routledge.

Chen, P. (2012). Empowering identity reconstruction of Indigenous college students through transformative learning. *Educational Review, 64*(2), 161–180. doi:10.1080/00131911.2011.592574

Chen, S.-H. (2015). Promoting international education for Indigenous elementary schools in Taiwan: School principals' perspectives. *Asian Social Science, 11*(9). doi:10.5539/ass.v11n9p21

Chen, S.-M., & Young, A. L. (2015). Dancing with ethnic identities: An aboriginal dance club in a Taiwanese middle school. *International Journal of Multicultural Education, 17*(2).

Cheng, S. Y. (2004). *The politics of identity and schooling: A comparative case study of American Indians and Taiwan Aborigines (China).* (PhD), University of California, Los Angeles. (AAT 3146619)

Chi, C.-C. (2007). The ideas and ideals of First Nations and their applications in Taiwan: A critical evaluation. *Taiwan International Studies Quarterly, 3*(2), 1-22.

Chi, C. C. (2012). *Indigenous movements and the making of multicultural Taiwan*. Taipei, Taiwan (R.O.C.): Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica.

Chou, H.-M. (2005). *Educating urban Indigenous students in Taiwan: Six teachers' perspectives* (PhD thesis). University of Maryland, USA.

Coca, N. (2013). Taiwan's culture revitalization efforts in action. *Cultural Survival Quarterly: Language and Cultures*. Cambridge, MA: Cultural Survival.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications.

Fenelon, J. V., & LeBeau D. (2006). Four directions for Indian education: Curriculum models for Lakota and Dakota teaching and learning. In I. Abu-Saad & D. Champagne (Eds.), *Indigenous education and empowerment: International perspectives* (pp. 21-68). Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.

Friedman, P. K. (2018). The hegemony of the local: Taiwanese multiculturalism and Indigenous identity politics. *Boundary 2, 45*(3), 79-105. doi:10.1215/01903659-6915593

Gao, P. (2001). *Minority, not minor*. Taipei, Taiwan (R.O.C.): Taiwan Today, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Giroux, H. (1995). Insurgent multiculturalism and the promise of pedagogy. In D. T. Goldberg (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: A critical reader* (pp. 325–343). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Gorski, P. (2016). Rethinking the role of "culture" in educational equity: From cultural competence to equity literacy. *Multicultural Perspectives, 18*(4), 221-226. doi:10.1080/15210960.2016.1228344

Hsieh, J. (2006). *Collective rights of Indigenous peoples: Identity-based movement of plain Indigenous in Taiwan*. New York/London: Routledge.

Huang, W.-D. (2007). *Indigenous students' negotiation of cultural differences: The construction of linguistic identities amongst Amis students in Taiwan*. Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, Institute of Education, University of London.

International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA), The. (2019*). The Indigenous world 2019.* Copenhagen, Denmark: The Author.

Jackson, L. (2014a). *Muslims and Islam in U.S. education: Reconsidering multiculturalism*. London/New York: Routledge.

Jackson, L. (2014b). Under construction: The development of multicultural curriculum in Hong Kong and Taiwan. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 23*(4), 885–893. doi:10.1007/s40299-014-0199-9

Kingsbury, B. (1998). "Indigenous peoples" in international law: A constructivist approach to the Asian controversy. In C. Erni (Ed.), *The concept of Indigenous peoples in Asia: A resource book* (pp. 103-158). Copenhagen/Chiang Mai: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA)/Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact Foundation (AIPP).

Ku, K.-h. (2012). Rights to recognition: Minorities and Indigenous politics in emerging Taiwan nationalism. In D. Blundell (Ed.), *Taiwan since martial law: Society, culture, politics, economy* (pp. 91-129). Shung Ye Museum of Formosan Aborigines, the University of California, Berkley, & National Taiwan University Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2003). Lies my teacher still tells. In G. Ladson-Billings (Ed.), *Critical race perspectives on social studies: The profession, policies, and curriculum* (pp. 1–11). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Law, W.-W. (2002). Education reform in Taiwan: A search for a 'national' identity through democratisation and Taiwanisation. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 32*(1), 61-81. doi:10.1080/03057920120116535

Lee, L., & Chen, P. (2014). Empowering Indigenous youth: Perspectives from a national service-learning program in Taiwan. *The International Indigenous Policy Journal, 5*(3). doi:10.18584/iipj.2014.5.3.4

Mao, C.-J. (1997). Constructing a new social identity: Taiwan's curricular reforms of the nineties. *International Journal of Educational Reform, 6*(4), 400-406.

Mason, R. (2009). Problematising multicultural art education in the context of Taiwan. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 39*(4), 455-468. doi:10.1080/03057920802366364

May, S. (1999). Critical multiculturalism and cultural difference: Avoiding essentialism. In S. May (Ed.), *Critical multiculturalism: Rethinking multicultural and antiracist education* (pp. 11–41). Philadelphia/London: Falmer Press.

Morris, A. (2007). *Kanō baseball and 'triethnic' identity in 1930s Taiwan.* Paper presented at the Conference of the Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California Berkeley.

Munsterhjelm, M. (2002). The First Nations of Taiwan: A special report on Taiwan's Indigenous peoples. *Cultural Survival Quarterly: Lands, Resources, and Environments.* Cambridge, MA: Cultural Survival.

Nesterova, Y. (2019). Teaching Indigenous children in Taiwan: Tensions, complexities, and opportunities. *Global Studies of Childhood, 9*(2), 156-166. doi:10.1177/2043619846349

Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

Nieto, S. (2005). Critical multicultural education and students' perspectives. In. S. May (Ed.), *Critical multiculturalism: Rethinking multicultural and anti-racist education* (pp. 209–235). London: Falmer Press.

Pawan, C. (2004). *Indigenous language education in Taiwan.* Paper presented at the 11th Annual Stabilizing Indigenous Languages Conference, University of California at Berkeley.

Rudolph, M. (2016). The quest for ethnic reclassification in multiculturalist Taiwan: The case of the Sakizaya. *Archiv Orientalni, 84*(2), 413-443.

Shih, C.-F. (2010). Academic colonialism and the struggle for Indigenous knowledge systems in Taiwan. *Social Alternatives, 29*(1), 44-47.

Simon, S. (2002). The underside of a miracle: Industrialization, land, and Taiwan's Indigenous peoples. *Cultural Survival Quarterly: Lands, Resources, and Environments.* Cambridge, MA: Cultural Survival.

St. Denis, V. (2011). Silencing aboriginal curricular content and perspectives through multiculturalism: "There are other children here". *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 33*(4), 306-317. doi:10.1080/10714413.2011.597638

Su, Y.-C. (2006). Political ideology and Taiwanese school curricula. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 7*(1), 41-50. doi:10.1007/BF03036783

Su, Y.-C. (2007). Ideological representations of Taiwan's history: An analysis of elementary social studies textbooks, 1978–1995. *Curriculum Inquiry, 37*(3), 205-237. doi:10.1111/j.1467-873X.2007.00383.x

Teng, E. J. (2004). *Taiwan's imagined geography: Chinese colonial travel writing and pictures, 1683-1895.* Cambridge (Massachusetts)/London: Harvard University Asia Center.

Tsao, F.-f. (1997). Preserving Taiwan's Indigenous languages and cultures: A discussion in sociolinguistic perspective. *Globalization and Indigenous Culture*. Retrieved from http://www2.kokugakuin.ac.jp/ijcc/wp/global/07tsao.html

Ukpokodu, O. (2003). Teaching multicultural education from a critical perspective: Challenges and dilemmas. *Multicultural Perspectives, 5*(4), 17–23.

Wang, L.-j. (2004). Multiculturalism in Taiwan: Contradictions and challenges in cultural policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy, 10*(3), 301-318. doi:10.1080/1028663042000312534

Yen, S.-H. (2009). Effective strategies for teaching Taiwanese minority students with low achievement and low socio-economic backgrounds. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 10*, 455–463. doi:10.1007/s12564-009-9053-9

Zilliacus, H., Holm, G. & Sahlström, F. (2017). Taking steps towards institutionalising multicultural education: The national curriculum of Finland. *Multicultural Education Review, 9*(4), 231-248. doi:10.1080/2005615X.2017.1383810

Multiculturalism and Multicultural Education Approaches to Indigenous People's Education in Taiwan

Yulia Nesterova

Faculty of Education, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR

yulia.nesterova@hku.hk

Multiculturalism and Multicultural Education Approaches to Indigenous People's Education in Taiwan

Taiwan has cast multicultural policies as a remedy for inequalities and injustices its 16 Indigenous groups face. Such policies aim to revive Indigenous languages and cultures and create a more welcoming and inclusive environment in schools. Despite the fact that Indigenous people are expected to be primary beneficiaries of these policies, not much is known about how they have affected Indigenous students and communities, if at all. Relying on in-depth semi-structured interviews with 16 Indigenous participants, this paper explores whether the policies have accomplished or are on the way to accomplishing the goals set, as seen by Indigenous people. The findings show that the multicultural approach to education is still informed by assimilationist logic that expects Indigenous people to adjust to the culture and orientations of the dominant group, and as such, does not redress the existing injustices and inequalities.

Character count: 54,032

Introduction

Since 1624 the Indigenous people on the island that is now known as Taiwan saw the establishment of colonial settlements on their land from diverse outside powers ranging from European (Portuguese, Dutch, and Spanish) to Asian (Chinese and Japanese). During this period, Indigenous groups went through forceful relocation, military subjugation, and harsh assimilationist policies that intended to 'civilize' them (Cauquelin, 2011; Pawan, 2004). Enforcement of a new type of education was viewed as the primary force to rid Indigenous people of their 'savagery' by 'civilizing' them into the 'superior' identity, culture, language, and ethics of the new rulers (Teng, 2004). The 'civilizing' methods included uprooting of Austronesian cultures, languages, and identities of the Indigenous people and replacing them with those of the dominant, ruling group (Morris, 2007; Simon, 2002).

The process of 'civilization' through assimilation intensified during the Japanese colonial rule (1895-1945) and martial law under the Chinese Nationalist Party (1949-1987). Assimilation has led to gradual destruction of Indigenous lifestyles, traditional

structures, and communities, and erosion of Indigenous languages, knowledge systems, identities, and cultures (Hsieh, 2006; Su, 2006). It has also pushed Indigenous people from the place of being the masters of the island and their own fate to a minority comprising only 2.39% of the population and having no control over their own development or that of society's political, social, and economic domains (see Chi, 2012; International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA), 2019). Centuries of domination and subjugation have brought economic and social marginalization and fragmentation to Indigenous communities and created a stereotyped image of an indolent, addictive, and illiterate 'Other' leading to discrimination against and low self-esteem and self-respect among Indigenous people (Chen & Young, 2015; Yen, 2009).

As martial law was repealed in 1987, Taiwan started transition from authoritarianism and repression of human and Indigenous rights and freedoms to democratization and Taiwanization/localization of development (Cauquelin, 2011; Law, 2002). Two of the features of this transition were re-discovery of ethnic and linguistic diversity of the island to establish a locally-rooted identity and culture for a cohesive and harmonious nation-building, and removal of injustices that laid barriers to Indigenous people's academic and socio-economic advancement. To aid this transitional process, 'multicultural Taiwan' was chosen as the national identity and strategy to work towards (Wang, 2004), and multicultural education – as a remedy to the inequalities and injustices Indigenous people have been experiencing in academic settings and beyond. This shift to multiculturalism was sustained by the development and implementation of new educational policies and standards including the *Indigenous Education Act* that was introduced in 1998 to improve Indigenous people's experiences and outcomes in mainstream educational institutions (Nesterova, 2019).

Based on a qualitative study across Taiwan's regions, this paper discusses whether multiculturalism in its current conceptualization and implementation in Taiwan has been responding to the complex and multifaceted matters experienced by the most disadvantaged group in the society – Indigenous people. The paper starts by introducing Taiwan's Indigenous people, their geographical, social, and cultural make-up and moves to explore the conceptions of Taiwan's multiculturalism(s) promoted by the two parties that have governed Taiwan since 1987 – Kuomintang/the Chinese Nationalist Party (henceforth, KMT) and the Democratic Progressive Party (henceforth, DPP) and their implementation in mainstream education system. After that, it presents Indigenous voices that examine and reflect on these multicultural ideas, polices, and practices to determine how effectively (or not) they work towards the set goals of revival of Indigenous identities and cultures and addressing injustices and inequalities Indigenous people face. The paper concludes by highlighting implications for multicultural education for Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Taiwan and beyond.

Indigenous people of Taiwan

As a multi-lingual and multi-cultural society, Taiwan hosts such major ethnic groups as Han Chinese (divided into Hakka, Waisheng or mainland Chinese, and Minnan) and the Indigenous people. While the Han Chinese settlers started moving to Taiwan in the 17th centuries, the exact date of Indigenous people's settlement on the island is not known. Nevertheless, archaeological records show that already in 300 AD Austronesians sailed from Taiwan to the Philippines and other parts of the world, influencing languages and cultures of the Maori, Indonesians, Hawaiians, and others (Coca, 2013).

The Indigenous people are further divided into 16 officially recognized groups and at least 9 groups referred to as *ping pu* who are seeking state-level recognition. The recognized groups comprise approximately 565,043 people, or 2.39% of the population of the island (IWGIA, 2019). While they all belong to the Austronesian family and have a shared history of colonization and assimilation, they differ in size, inhabit different areas across the island, and exhibit differences in their socio-cultural organization (see Table 1). After centuries of colonization by outside powers, the main concerns the Indigenous people grapple with include disappearing cultures and languages, low socio-economic status, and limited political and economic influence (IWGIA, 2019).

Table 1. Recognized Indigenous Groups: Demographics, Locations, Characteristics

№	Name	Population	Location	Characteristics
1	Amis	177,000	Hualien and Taitung	Matrilineal system of social organization: female leadership of the private sphere (including property ownership), male leadership of the public sphere (laws, tribal politics, and others).
2	Paiwan	86,000	Sandimen and Taitung	The chief should be of the noble class. The chief acts as the leader in politics, military, and religion.
3	Atayal	81,000	New Taipei, Hualien, Hsinchu, Nantou	Facial tattoos are a long-standing tradition. Ancestral worship rituals are the key social/religious activity. Red clothes are favored as it represents blood that drives evil spirits away.
4	Bunun	50,000	Nantou, Kaohsiung, Eastern Taiwan	Patriarchal social structure; family members may include non-family blood relation; schedule their ceremonies according to millet planting, weeding, and harvest.
5	Truku	24,000	Taroko Gorge	Were at the forefront fighting the Japanese invasion; still keep their traditional technique of shaman sorcery and worship ancestors in special ceremonies every year.

6	Puyuma	11,000	Taitung	Divided into 8 sub-tribes that have different mythology about their creation; have 2 traditional systems of social organization: 1. family system with inheritance by the eldest daughter, and 2. organized by the different ages of men.
7	Rukai	11,600	Taitung and Wutai	Traditional social structure is comprised of commoners and nobles; with the latter have more economic and land privileged; commoners can be elevated to nobility through leadership and harvest production.
8	Sediq	10,000	Nantou	Traditional religion is based on 'utux', which means 'ancestral spirits'. Disrespecting utux brings disaster and misfortune. The group has the mosy conscious living, worships Sisin, the sacred bird, and makes decisions based on the sound the bord makes.
9	Tsou	6,500	Alishan	Very strict patriarchal structure; the social and political organization includes small and large well-organized clans; all decisions are made by men. Major ceremonies include war ritual and ancestral spirit worship.
10	Saisiyat	5,300	Hsinchu and Miaoli	Patriarchal structure of the tribe with women having no authority and inheritance rights for men only; consists of a number of sub-tribes that have equal status in relation to each other.
11	Dao	3,500	Orchid Island	Live offshore, isolated from the other groups, as a result, culture is relatively intact; social affairs are run by male heads of households and community's fishing groups. Famous for traditional boats, female hair dances.
12	Kavalan	1,100	Hualien and Yilan	The group believes that each living and non-living creature has its own spirit; has special offering ceremony and healing ceremony performed by a female shaman.

13	Thao	648	Sun Moon Lake	Patriarchal society; tribal chief, the position is inherited by the eldest son, is the main decision maker. The group was strongly influenced by the Chinese, but still holds to its traditions, one of them is having a basket with ancestor spirit at home.
14	Kanakanavu	520	Kaohsiung	Patrilineal society; has ceremonies to express gratitude for millet that is part of their daily diet and to the river for fish and other resources.
15	Hlaaula	400	Kaohsiung	Currently 3 main communities that are led by individual hereditary leaders and an assembly of elders and chiefs that make decisions about public affairs.
16	Sakizaya	335	Hualien (among Amis people)	Matrilineal system, a man moves to his wife's house after marriage. Fishing and hunting are traditional ways of life. 'Miamaivaki' is the ceremony in which elders give regards to young group members.

Multicultural education

In this work, multicultural education is defined as "education that aims to respond to the presence of diversity and inequality in society" (Jackson, 2014a, p. 12). It does so by defining the overall approach to education that further influences curriculum development and other related practices. Jackson (2014a) differentiates between assimilationist and pluralist approaches to multiculturalism. Assimilationist approach sees differences between groups as deficiencies and barriers to equality and social progress. Minority groups are expected to abandon their cultural practices and orientations and adjust to those of the dominant group. Education then plays a role of the initiator of these disadvantaged groups into the values, mannerism, and practices of the broader society.

Jackson (2014a) contrasts assimilationism with pluralist approach which she divides into multiculturalism and critical multiculturalism. The former views cultural and social difference as good and worthy of public recognition and toleration and posits that dismissing diverse cultural representations and references harm minorities, their self-esteem and identity. The latter rejects the status quo that keeps minorities in an inferior and disadvantaged position and calls it unjust and unethical. Education through multicultural lens looks to preserve diverse cultures and teach their members to live peacefully together, whereas critical multicultural education also works to dismantle oppressive structures that disadvantage and marginalize minority groups.

In school contexts, critical multiculturalism does so by self-consciously and critically assessing, challenging, and rejecting racism, discrimination, and unequal power dynamics in policies and practices and their negative impact on marginalized and vulnerable students (Nieto, 2005). Schools that adopt critical multiculturalism as its philosophy, first, affirm pluralism represented by their staff, students, and their communities and incorporate diverse knowledges, histories, and value systems into a teaching-learning paradigm in an ethical and responsible manner (see May, 1999; Nieto, 2000). Second, they emphasize a proactive and conscious engagement with issues of social justice to transform "the diverse histories, cultural narratives, representations, and institutions that produce racism and other forms of discrimination" (Giroux, 1995, p. 328) and construct just, equitable, "culturally responsive and responsible practice[s]" (Ukpokodu, 2003, p. 19).

As far as multicultural curriculum is concerned, Banks (1989) proposes four types. Contributions type keeps curriculum structure and goals unchanged while focusing on integrating certain ethnic and cultural references such as ethnic heroes, food, music, and dance on specific days. This approach is the easiest for teachers to

adopt, but it teaches nothing about ethnic groups and tends to "gloss over important concepts and issues related to the victimization and oppression of ethnic groups and their struggles against racism and for power" (Banks, 1989, p. 17).

Additive type adds to the existing curriculum some selected literature, units or courses that discuss topics related to ethnic and cultural diversity issues. While there is a certain addition in this type, no fundamental changes are made in the curriculum, and content is chosen by the dominant group to comply with criteria and perspectives of the mainstream society. This approach fails to equip students with skills to see their society from differing perspectives and to understand connections between histories and cultures of diverse groups. As Ladson-Billings (2003) explains, this approach leaves the "monocultural, exclusive narrative" unchallenged (p. 9).

Transformation type sets to change basic assumptions in the curriculum. Similar to critical multiculturalism, it integrates diverse concepts, problems, perspectives, and references to make students look at different issues and events from differing worldviews and points of view. Curriculum undergoes fundamental changes to integrate a variety of (divergent) perspectives, meanings, and content to fully understand the complexity of their society. Finally, decision-making and social action type is an enhanced transformation type as it also aims to equip students with such skills as research skills, political efficacy, critical thinking, and critical decision-making and action.

Multicultural education and Indigenous people in Taiwan

Despite being the authoritarian ruler that established martial law in 1949, the KMT was the party that – though under immense pressure – initiated and carried through the transition to democracy, remaining the principal power until 2000 when Chen Shui-bian

of the DPP became the president of Taiwan (Caldwell, 2018). KMT won presidential elections in 2008 and remained in power until 2016 when another DPP's choice, a woman politician with Indigenous ancestry, Tsai Ing-wen was elected president. It is these two parties' politics that have been shaping multiculturalism and multicultural education that affected Indigenous education in Taiwan in the democratic period: KMT from 1987 to 2000 and from 2008 to 2016 and DPP from 2000 to 2008 and from 2016 until now.

For both parties, multiculturalism acted as a way to address two acute matters facing the society in transition to democracy. One was formation of a new identity of Taiwan's citizens and the other – finding remedies for inequalities and injustices experienced by Indigenous and other minority groups (Cheng, 2004; Ku, 2012). If the views on identity formation have seen certain fundamental differences between the parties due to their political and geopolitical directions (especially relationships and ties with Mainland China), their approaches to addressing inequalities Indigenous groups experience have been much the same.

KMT multiculturalism started as a response to the need to deconstruct the coercively imposed uniform and nationalist Chinese identity and build a new identity to reflect the society's multicultural heritage and liberal democratic values in post-authoritarian era (Jackson, 2014b). The KMT model of multiculturalism is hierarchal as it places the dominant Chinese culture on top followed by all the other island's minority cultures (e.g., Indigenous, Hakka). This approach was best described by the former president Lee Teng Hui of the KMT party who, talking about the Indigenous population of Taiwan, said that they "have to 'melt' into Taiwanese society" without which they "cannot exist" (Wang, 2004, p. 307).

Critics of KMT multiculturalism suggest that highlighting Indigenous and minority cultures as part of multicultural Taiwan and its multicultural education was a way to form a new nationalism (Wang, 2004) and to pacify "an unrestful Taiwan population" (Mao, 1997, p. 404). Indigenous cultures were not viewed as worthy to survive in their entirety and standing on their own, without integration into the dominant Chinese structure. Efforts were therefore directed at preserving the parts of it and addressing the needs of Indigenous people that could be tolerated in the mainstream sinocentric society and education (Mao, 1997).

KMT has taken a series of actions to enact their model of multicultural Taiwan. The first action was the 1992 amendment of the Constitution to pledge assistance to Indigenous cultural and language revival. The amendment intended to allocate funding and other support to promote and teach Indigenous languages and cultures and conduct research on Indigenous issues. As Tsao (1997) shows, only a small number of intended activities were even started or completed, and most of them were too impractical, small-scale, and in some cases too late to be able to address the urgent issues Indigenous communities faced (e.g., language and knowledge loss and structural injustices).

In 1996 the Commission on Education Reform implemented a new educational policy referred to as 'dual cultural identities' attempting to aid the revival of Indigenous identities (Huang, 2007). The policy failed to produce positive results as Indigenous children were still educated in predominantly Chinese environment. Such education distressed their Indigenous identities and mother tongue skills as Mandarin was used as the only language of instruction while Indigenous languages were labelled as "informal, useless, playful, traditional and backward" (Huang, 2007, p. 16). The consequence of this treatment of Indigenous languages was their continued destruction: the 2004 survey

showed that only 9% of Indigenous children could speak their respective Indigenous mother tongues (Pawan, 2004). Despite that, KMT-led multicultural reforms in 1990s, including that of the introduction of the *Twelve Education Reform Mandates* in 1998 led to a more integrated multicultural curriculum that focused on diversity, local issues, respect and protection of diverse cultures, and prevention of prejudice and discrimination (Jackson, 2014b).

Another key measure taken by KMT in support of Indigenous development, for example, includes recognizing Indigenous groups as Indigenous or *yuan-chu-min* 原住民族 in Chinese ("original people's group") through amendments in the Constitution in 1994 (Kingsbury, 1998). This move gave them – at least on paper – powers and rights to control their development and receive support to carry required changes through. Introduction of the *Education Act for Indigenous Peoples* in 1998 (amended in 2015) was another positive development that gave Indigenous communities the right to establish their own educational spaces and structures, promote Indigenous languages, history, and culture in mainstream institutions, and ensure that discrimination, racism, and misrepresentation are addressed. Initiatives that emerged ensured access for Indigenous children to quality schools (Cheng, 2004) and additional points for passing the National Proficiency Test of Aboriginal Languages (PTAL) to be admitted to tertiary institutions (Rudolph, 2016). Yet, the schools that serve Indigenous students, still tend to lack adequate funding, resources, facilities, and qualified teachers (Chou, 2005; Nesterova, 2019).

DPP's need for multiculturalism, especially with the focus on legitimizing Indigenous identities, stemmed from the political necessity to ensure sovereignty from Mainland China (Ku, 2012). As a result, it has led to a slightly different model of

multiculturalism that prioritizes the so-called localized Taiwanese culture followed in the hierarchy by Chinese and then global cultures (including Japanese, Western, and migrant workers from other Asian states). The Taiwanese culture in this case is a merger of diverse cultures that developed on the island prior to martial law. It thus incorporates the cultures of Hoklo and Hakka people (Chinese people who started settling in Taiwan in the 17th century) and those of Indigenous people that belong to the Austronesian family (Wang, 2004).

The DPP model was put forward by president Chen Shui-bian who envisioned a mosaic of cultures that would live peacefully with each other to create, what he called, a harmonious symphony (Wang, 2004). Despite the theoretical shift from a hierarchy to mosaic of cultures and a more substantial acknowledgement of Indigenous identities in shaping the local culture and identity, Chen's idea was hardly widely accepted. Indigenous cultures are still seen as comprising an insignificant part of the local Taiwanese culture (2.39% of the population as opposed to approximately 70% of the Hoklo people of Chinese ancestry) and as a consequence were in need to melt into the Taiwanese identity. Nevertheless, president Chen officially announced in 2001 that multiculturalism would be the national policy to help reaffirm democracy (Law, 2002) and identity of Taiwanese people (Mason, 2009). In relation to Indigenous people, in 1999 Chen's administration developed a "New Partnership" agreement to aid work on Indigenous autonomy and related powers (Chi, 2007). A positive development of this decision has been the change from treating the Indigenes as a monolithic and homogenous ethnic group to treating them as individual groups (Rudolph, 2016).

Apart from the concerns for the development of a new identity and revival of Indigenous cultures and languages, another urgent matter for KMT and DPP has been

academic underachievement of Indigenous students. In different periods it was determined by Taiwan-based studies that Indigenous children do not succeed academically in mainstream educational institutions due to their cultural differences from the mainstream (see Lee & Chen, 2014; S.-H. Chen, 2015; P. Chen, 2012; Huang, 2007). Indigenous cultural difference has been seen as cultural deficiency that prevented Indigenous children from adjusting to the learning environment and academic expectations of Taiwan's schooling.

The remedy that would correct such problematic experiences was found in multicultural education that was executed in educational institutions in the form of introduction of performative Indigenous cultures. Multicultural education then became restricted to what Taiwan's scholars refer to as "artsy" (Wang, 2014) and "touristy" (Chou, 2005) practices. Chi (2012, p. 3) pointed out that such practices manifest in "the celebration of distinct cultural expressions and performances." Such decisions are made due to the superficial understanding of multiculturalism (Fenelon & LeBeau, 2006), the needs of Indigenous people, and the stereotypical image of Indigenous groups as people who lead "carefree lives singing and dancing" (Gao, 2001).

Chou (2005) blamed this on ethnic and racial blindness of Taiwan's multicultural policies. The studies conducted by Cheng (2004) and Yen (2009) also determined that it is racist attitudes of non-Indigenous teachers who lack knowledge about Indigenous people and skills to engage with them and instead, stereotype and discriminate against Indigenous people, their cultures and identities. The danger is not only that such unhealthy environment in schools leads to lack of motivation to study on behalf of Indigenous children. This focus on artistic expression of Indigenous groups, lack of accurate and comprehensive representation of them in the classroom, and

unwillingness to address racism perpetuate stereotypes and prejudices about Indigenous people and their lifestyles (Su, 2006; 2007) and diminish the complexity and intersectionality of their identities (Gorski, 2016) to dance, song, and 'costume'.

The focus on artistic and touristy components of Indigenous cultures can be a consequence not purely of misunderstanding of multiculturalism, but of intentional pursuit of economic benefits from the 'exotic' cultures of Indigenous people. The Austronesian identity of the Indigenes has been used as backdoor diplomacy to establish neo-liberal free trade contracts with countries with Austronesian population in the Pacific (Friedman, 2018) and to sign memorandums of understanding with Canada and Australia which certainly resulted in benefits of intercultural exchange between Indigenous people of Taiwan, Canada, and Australia (Munsterhjelm, 2002). Locally, the stereotypical identity of a joyous, dancing, and singing Indigene has been recreated to promote tourism within Taiwan and to showcase Indigenous people at national events (Munsterhjelm, 2002) to solidify a localized Taiwanese identity. To accomplish this, Indigenous people are expected to be more authentic than authentic to be attractive to the outsiders. This condition fractures Indigenous communities and hampers the development of strong Indigenous identities and cultures effectively forcing the Indigenes to focus on "local authenticity at the expense of other forms of legitimacy" (Friedman, 2018, p. 97).

It should be admitted that the KMT and DPP multicultural policies and practices have opened up possibilities of revival of Indigenous cultures and search for identities. As Jackson's (2014b) analysis of Taiwan's curriculum suggests, education *has* become less assimilationist and more multicultural. Nevertheless, neither parties have managed to respond to these needs in a more profound manner nor have they been able to address

more structural and complex matters hampering Indigenous development (Shih, 2010). The focus on Indigenous artistic performances alone conceals a more urgent need in developing Indigenous communities – the need to not only revive Indigenous worldviews, knowledge systems, and philosophies, but to address racial and socio-economic inequalities and injustices (St. Denis, 2011).

Materials and methods

This study is a part of a larger qualitative research project on the development of Indigenous education conducted in Taiwan. The qualitative research design was selected as the aim of the project was to understand the "phenomenon from the views of the participants" (Creswell, 2009, p. 16). Apart from that, a qualitative inquiry allowed to establish close contacts with the participants to develop trust and rapport which helped them to open up and be willing to let the researcher to come for any clarifications and additional information. The use of interviews also enabled more comprehensive discussions about the matter under study as the participants spent extended periods of time with the researcher.

The data were collected during a fieldwork across Taiwan in August 2016. Sixteen Indigenous people participated in in-depth semi-structured interviews evaluating and reflecting on the education policies implemented during 1990s and 2000s. The participants included six Taiwan's Indigenous leaders (IL) and ten professors (P) all of whom work to assist Indigenous communities' development and promotion of Indigenous cultures, knowledge, and education (see Table 2). They came from diverse Indigenous groups (e.g., Amis, Bunun, Puyuma, Paiwan, and others) in which they were considered as respected and trusted leaders by their people. All participants were all above the age of 35 to ensure that in their interviews they could

rely on their substantial experience (at least 10 years) in Indigenous affairs and understanding of the complexities and factors of Indigenous development within the local and global contexts.

Table 2. Profiles of interview participants

Participant	Location	Primary Fields of Expertise
P1	Taichung	Professor: Indigenous education, Indigenous language, Indigenous culture
P2	Taitung	Professor: Indigenous and minority languages and education, multiculturalism
P3	Hualien	Professor: Indigenous rights, justice, land rights, political science and law
P4	Tainan	Professor: Indigenous knowledge, Higher Education
P5	Taitung	Professor: Indigenous rural education, cultural revival
P6	Taichung	Professor: Justice, Indigenous rights, Indigenous economic development
P7	Taichung	Professor: Indigenous development, cultural revival
P8	Taitung	Professor: Indigenous language education, urban indigenous communities
P9	Hualien	Professor: Indigenous grassroots political movement, Indigenous education, Indigenous language
P10	Tainan	Professor: Indigenous education, Indigenous languages
IL1	Taichung	Indigenous education, cultural revival
IL2	Taitung	Indigenous rights, Indigenous governance, cooperation between and among groups
IL3	Taitung	Indigenous rights, cultural revival
IL4	Hualien	Indigenous rights, grassroots movement for education, language and cultural revival
IL5	Hualien	Rural indigenous development, environmental sustainability
IL6	Hualien	Immersion schools for indigenous children, rural development

As the participants live across Taiwan – from the western and more developed cities of Taichung and Tainan where Indigenous people were affected by colonization most to the eastern part of Hualien and Taitung where the mountains provided a barrier that kept the colonial powers away for a much longer period of time – the interviews took place in these four cities and counties. Each interview lasted from one hour to two hours and a half. The interviews were conducted in English except for one that required Chinese-English interpreters and two others that asked for an interpreter to be present in case they would have difficulty in expressing themselves. The interpreters were two Indigenous women with full proficiency in the languages of the study and accepted members in the Indigenous communities the participant came from. All the interviews were audio-recorded with the written consent of the participants after the aim of the study, its procedure, potential benefits and consequences had been discussed in detail. After that, each interview was transcribed verbatim in English, and in the case of the interviews conducted (partly or fully) in Chinese, Chinese and English transcriptions were done and cross-checked by another interpreter fluent in two languages.

To analyze the data, cross-sectional and case studies approach were used. The cross-sectional method consisted of identifying common themes, categories, and patterns and after that merging the participants' responses under them, comparing and contrasting their views and insights. Then, each participant's story was approached as an individual case to tell a distinct story or narrative about the topic of the study.

Results

Two distinctive policies

Discussing Taiwan's multicultural policies, all participants agreed that Indigenous people should not side with either of the two leading parties as no party prioritizes

Indigenous needs. Despite that, they all shared that if they compare how Indigenous people have been treated by KMT and DPP during the democratization period, they referred to KMT policies as "assimilationist" and "welfare colonialis[t]" whereas DPP is viewed as a more "localized" and "Indigenized" party capable of more profound multicultural reforms. As an Indigenous leader (#IL6) recounted:

> There is a very long history for the KMT as a ruling party. … their main policy - we can call it colonizing, assimilation. So, it is hardly you can hear during their regime that the so-called multiculturalism or even the respect Indigenous traditional culture and knowledge, the language… and revitalize it, it's very hard. But the more Indigenized and localized the party DPP, it is very ... On the contrary, they want to be with the Indigenous people, and they have to understand that they somehow have the same fate with the Indigenous people.

Inequality in resources and representation in education

Nevertheless, the participants were united in saying that the existing multicultural policies – whether they were issued by KMT or DPP – are not sufficient for creating a multicultural society. The reason is that the authorities and institutions do not pay due attention to the revival of Indigenous cultures, languages, and knowledge(s), strengthening of Indigenous identities, or dealing with academic underachievement, low socio-economic status, and discrimination against Indigenous people. This lack of real engagement with Indigenous issues on behalf of the authorities is a major concern Indigenous people have regarding their own development. As they shared, since the establishment of the quasi-ministerial Council of Indigenous Peoples (CIP) in 1996, the responsibility to manage Indigenous education has been placed on this institution that is often under-funded and lacks power similar to the Ministry of Education (MOE), for example. As a professor (#P5) explained:

> Even if they think they are doing multiculturalism. But I don't buy it. Because they don't really think about how this Indigenous peoples' education, to revitalize our language. They think that it's business of CIP, not the government. … And, actually, one of the problems related to Indigenous education is that MOE they take control of general education, and CIP need to

> deal with Indigenous education. Sometimes if you want to do something for Indigenous education, there is a problem with this two. MOE is higher status than CIP, they have more money.

Despite the responsibility being placed on CIP, the institution does not only have limited finances or power, it has no control over mainstream education the vast majority of Indigenous and non-Indigenous students attend. Schools are managed by MOE that determines the structure, content, pedagogy, and other academic matters. As it was noted by the participants, all the decisions are informed by the dominant Chinese conceptions of education and societal success, and this is also reflected in the educational approach and the teaching contents and pedagogy that are the same for Indigenous and non-Indigenous students. In terms of the multicultural educational approach, a professor (#P8) observed:

> There is something like culture plus approach. Where basically you have the mainstream culture and then you add on a few days, classes a week to learn about each local culture.

The culture plus approach also includes adding cultural events where Indigenous people are asked to wear traditional clothing and perform traditional songs and dances to parents of non-Indigenous students. Apart from being viewed as exploitative and superficial, the participants said that this approach to education, teaching, and content:

> … is not fair. You cannot teach every child the same thing, the same cultures, the same languages. Because children are from different background. How can you do that? We call that 'assimilationist policies' (#P1).

Languages and education

Language policy and language use are two other areas that shows the "failure" of the multicultural approach. Reflecting on the language policy, a professor (#P1) stated that:

> The government might say they are using the multiculturalism policy for Indigenous peoples, but I don't think so. They provided us with a language policy and language lessons in early childhood education. In pre-school it is one class once a week. It is lesser than learning English. English, I believe, it's

> two hours per week. You can see the difference. And the government will tell you, this is what I give you, at least this is something. But this is not enough.

It was explained by the others that each lesson of an Indigenous language lasts only 40 minutes, and it may not take place every week as such "insignificant classes" get cancelled in favour of math test or a sports event. Additionally, although it is a 40-minute class, there are only around 15 minutes of the actual language lesson because a teacher can sing or read something in an Indigenous language, but all explanations come in Mandarin. Such an arrangement makes it hard to master a language.

Another professor (#P7) shared:

> It doesn't matter where you go, Mandarin is everywhere. Chinese culture, conceptions are everywhere. And even at home we can't learn about our culture and our language, as our people don't speak this language.

The issue, however, is not only with the loss of Indigenous languages and related knowledge as there is no space to learn and practice them. What worries the participants is that education in Chinese environment with the Chinese language, culture, and knowledge system, makes it challenging for Indigenous students to find meaning, belonging, and identity in the education they receive thus complicating their adjustment to the system and understanding of the material. As one Indigenous leader (#IL6) explained, echoing the other participants, "… for Indigenous people, it is difficult to learn their system, we need to overcome these difficulties that come from language and culture."

Inequity of educational opportunity

As most of the participants expressed the difficulty stems from the policies being "simply not fair" as they do not have equal educational opportunity. By educational opportunity these participants do not mean educational access because access is ensured by law. What they focus on instead is a form of multiculturalism sensitive to Indigenous needs: one that acknowledges their languages, cultures, identities, traditions, histories, and lifestyles. As participants concluded, they are provided with equal access to good schools. The problem, however, is that many Indigenous students drop out of these schools that are not trained nor willing to deal with Indigeneity.

Unsatisfactory content of education

Dropping out of school and unsatisfactory academic achievements of those who finish schools are also a result of insensitive content of education which slows down their progress and/or makes the environment unbearable. The participants shared that the content represents Indigenous people as "barbarians" willing to assimilate to a civilized culture of the settlers. For this, textbooks use stories to promote a particular narrative. For example, a professor (#P1) stated that:

> The textbook doesn't talk about the contribution of Indigenous people. They talk only a little bit about Indigenous peoples. And they bring stereotypical image of Indigenous people.

All the participants agreed that the history of colonization of the island has been ignored. Instead, Chinese people are presented as pioneers on the quest to civilize barbarian and primitive Indigenous people. They said:

> They talk about colonialism in a positive way. They say pioneering of Indigenous land. They try to say that barbarians were civilized. They still say that. They still think that we are primitive (#P1).

As a result, the participants argued, children may be afraid to share that they are Indigenous as some non-Indigenous people "still would joke about that word 'barbarian'" (#IL4) and share degrading stories of Indigenous "savage cultures" (#P5). Such a view of Indigenous people as being uncivilized and barbarian, it was retorted, leads to discrimination and racist attacks and treatment by non-Indigenous people.

Learning about Indigeneity in schools

What is of concern is that education about Indigenous people is not part of the curriculum in Taiwan. This has created a situation when Indigenous people know everything about the dominant group and non-Indigenous people have no or limited knowledge about Indigenous people and their – in parts oppressive – history with the Chinese majority group. Very often such knowledge is based on stereotypes and misrepresentation which creates resentment on the part of Indigenous people. Some participants shared that "they [the dominant Chinese group] learn little about us" (#P2)

and "they don't want to know anything" (#P7). The result, the Indigenous participants said, is that there is no understanding by non-Indigenous people of what changes are required to address the struggles of Indigenous people in the mainstream society and education system. Most of them reflected that the dominant group does not know about the reality Indigenous people live in and mostly sees them through a negative lens.

> They think we are not good people, we are inferior, and they have to help us. … They stigmatize us, and we stigmatize ourselves. It's psychological, very negative influence (#IL6).

Such lack of knowledge and understanding by the dominant group is not viewed in society as problematic despite the fact that institutions, including the MOE, deal with Indigenous affairs with no comprehensive understanding of Indigenous contexts and needs. As it was mentioned by 15 participants, non-Indigenous institutions are unwilling to get to know and understand Indigenous people, their affairs and values, and, thus are not able to do much to help Indigenous communities. One professor (#P1) maintained that:

> MOE does have a unit that deals with Indigenous education. It is small. In that unit they don't understand Indigenous education. That unit need to have more people who are familiar with Indigenous education, language, culture.

Colonization of Indigenous mind

Lack of knowledge about Indigenous cultures, affairs, and related matters among the dominant group representatives and institutions is not the only worry. The real problem, repeated by everyone in the study, is that the Indigenous mind is colonized and is overreliant on the dominant structures and mentality. An Indigenous leader (#IL6) put it neatly:

> We are double-blind. One blind for our knowledge, the other for theirs. We don't have the opportunity, time, or space to learn our ways, ourselves.

Multicultural education, therefore, for them would mean not only the dominant society learning about Indigenous history and heritage as well as colonial legacy that has affected them. It should also include Indigenous people learning about themselves, recognizing and respecting their cultures, re-building and strengthening their identities, and reviving and maintaining their cultures, languages, and traditions.

Uniqueness of Indigeneity

In addition, it was emphasized throughout the interviews, multiculturalism in Taiwan cannot be developed with the benefit for Indigenous people if the "uniqueness and value of each group" (#IL3) is not recognized. In relation to education, the participants shared, this concerns the difference of mentalities, values, knowledges, languages, and identities Indigenous and non-Indigenous people have. Multiculturalism in the view of these participants should mean development of "each group in its own unique cultural way while developing together at the same time by working as a team" (#P4). This way, Indigenous participants believe, multicultural Taiwan will be possible.

Discussion

Multicultural approach

Looking at the construction of multiculturalism in Taiwan, we can see some progression of Taiwan's multicultural education in the past few decades. The dominant rhetoric has shifted from seeing the dominant Chinese culture as superior and those of Indigenous people as barbarian and uncivilized (assimilationism) to acknowledging the existence of Indigenous cultures and seeing their contribution, although restricted to certain expressions and monitored (and disciplined?) by the dominant group, as valuable (pluralism: multiculturalism).

The approach is, however, still mixed and informed more by assimilationism than multiculturalism. Taiwan's Indigenes are still expected to adjust to the culture and orientations of the dominant group when in the public sphere, not revive and expand their own, Indigenous cultural references. Their presence, cultures, and identities are tolerated and even praised by the wider society for their artistic performances that contribute to visible diversity, construction of counter-Mainland Chinese identity, and the economic domain through tourism.

Multicultural education policies aim to preserve Indigenous cultures allegedly to benefit Indigenous people. However, preservation concerns only some tolerable Indigenous characteristics such as dance, song, and costume for someone else's entertainment and monetary benefit while putting Indigenous cultures and identities in a box where they cannot develop, change, and adjust for fear of not being seen 'authentic'. That which does not fit within the boundaries of the dominant epistemology and ontology and which cannot therefore be tolerated should then be "domesticated" or "made similar," as Andreotti (2011) explains.

Another example that showcases assimilationism of Taiwan's multiculturalism is the establishment of a semi-efficient under-funded Indigenous government in the form of CIP that is charged with dealing with Indigenous issues that the dominant institutions (including MOE and mainstream schools) do not take on. This shows that Indigenous matters are pushed into its own domain that does not intersect or work substantially with the public domain that is led and shaped by the dominant group with little, if any, contribution by the Indigenes. As a result, multicultural policies that are expected to benefit Indigenous communities, have done little for them.

Another problematic side of Taiwan's multiculturalism is that multicultural education is not seen as substantial or genuine and can be argued to be done for the

wrong reasons. Unlike Jackson's conceptualization of multiculturalism that sees refusal to integrate minorities' cultural references into the majority culture as harming minority's self-esteem and identity, in Taiwan the reforms are enacted not to develop and strengthen Indigenous self-respect and identities but to pacify unrestful Indigenous population. This is well represented in what one of the participants shared discussing how the local government reacts to dissatisfaction of Indigenous people with the current reforms and policies. They say: "this is what I give you, at least this is something" (#P1).

One major reason for multicultural reforms not being sensitive or relevant for Indigenous groups' needs and interests is the colonized mentality. Such mentality – informed by the conceptions and cultural references of the Chinese group – shapes and determines the development of institutions, educational content, and pedagogy. As the system is believed by the Indigenes to be inflexible and unwilling to undergo substantial changes, not only full multiculturalism but also critical multiculturalism cannot be achieved: the status quo is maintained and there may be no awareness that it needs to be questioned. As a result, Indigenous people are kept in a disadvantaged and marginalized position and prevented from attaining justice and equality.

Multicultural curriculum

One of the outcomes of the assimilationist approach with some elements of multiculturalism used in Taiwan is that curriculum (including content, textbook, and pedagogy) adopts the contributions approach, as conceptualized by Banks (1989). In the context of Taiwan it is limited to Indigenous people receiving one 40-munite lesson of Indigenous culture and language per week and showcasing Indigenous performative culture to the dominant group during school extra-curricular events. This approach is not efficient for reviving Indigenous cultures and languages, engineering a culturally

sensitive and relevant environment for Indigenous students, or addressing racism and discrimination they may experience from non-Indigenous people. The approach simply adds a course on Indigenous cultures and languages for some Indigenous people and a performance to enjoy for non-Indigenous people. It does not introduce essential Indigenous-friendly modifications into the curriculum and does not add discussions on diversity and Indigenous issues the additive approach would.

The problematic aspect of this approach to multiculturalism is not only that students do not learn to see their society from the perspectives of its diverse members, their histories and cultures, as Banks (1989) suggests. What this approach does to Indigenous people is it makes education for them largely meaningless and not healthy for building and strengthening Indigenous identities and cultures. It also makes it hard for them to progress academically as learning environments are structured around concepts, language, history representation, knowledge system, and other essential dimensions of the dominant group at the expense of Indigenous philosophies, knowledge systems, views of history, contributions to the society, and other aspects that would make education for Indigenous people relevant, sensitive, and welcoming.

At the same time, Indigenous children can observe that the knowledge, cultures, orientations, and language that are favoured belong to the dominant group, making them feel that whatever Indigenous world has to offer is worthless and irrelevant. As Fenelon and LeBeau (2006, p. 28) put it, when schools promote truth and knowledge of the dominant group as it is *the only* truth and knowledge, they "render all other ways of life/thought/feelings/embodiment as invalid." Denying Indigenous world to enter mainstream schooling shows disrespect towards Indigenous belief systems, values, and contexts. This position – whether explicitly or implicitly – designs education strategies and policies that intend to assimilate Indigenous groups into the dominant culture.

Another concern for the curriculum is not only lack of cultural references and Indigenous knowledge(s) and philosophies, but limited representation and misrepresentation of Indigenous and Chinese groups in the curriculum. This representation is constructed and controlled by the dominant group that shapes the discourse on Indigenous people and issues and creates a particular image the Chinese group – and Indigenous people – have about the Indigenous world. As can be seen from the findings, the Indigenous discourse sees Indigenous cultures in a stereotypical and negative way which can reinforce the superiority of the dominant, Chinese group, and the need to assimilate Indigenous people.

Implications for Taiwan's multicultural education

Taiwan's multicultural education can be said to be a mix of assimilationism and elements of the multicultural stage of pluralism enacted in the education system through the contributions approach to multicultural curriculum reform. Based on the discussions with the Indigenous participants, it can be determined that such form of multiculturalism has not done and is not expected to do what the Indigenous people need for the revival of their communities. Positive and substantial changes can take place if multicultural policies adopt the approach of critical multiculturalism and the curriculum will be revised and modified to use decision-making and social action approach. After all, Zilliacus and colleagues (2017, p. 231) are right in saying that "narrow notions of what multicultural education is threaten the politically rooted movement for equity and social justice." The goals that are pursued by Indigenous people in Taiwan and elsewhere.

If adopted, critical multiculturalism approach can help enforce the rejection of the status quo in the society and call on various parties to work towards justice and

equity for Indigenous communities. The revised model of education in this case will work to teach all students whether they are Indigenous or not to acquire skills to see the complex relations between histories, legacy, and development to understand the struggles and needs of different populations. Such educational approach will also work to dismantle unjust and oppressive structures that marginalize, silence, fetishize, and stereotype some groups, their cultures, perspectives, worldviews, and identities. Banks' decision-making and social action approach can aid this process through major transformations in the curriculum, including textbooks and pedagogies used by teachers, and teacher education itself. One lesson of Indigenous culture and language for Indigenous students per week therefore should transform to the inclusion of Indigenous philosophies, views, perspectives, histories, and other orientations into all school subjects.

However, changes in content, although fundamental and substantial, may not be enough to achieve justice and equality. Apart from learning about the Indigenous Other, their contribution, and colonization of their lands and destruction of their cultures that led to the current low socio-economic status, non-Indigenous students need to unlearn bias and racist stereotypes about Indigenous communities and be proactive in the work towards Indigenous justice and equality. Critical multicultural education is one such way as it aims to transform the perceptions of and attitudes towards the Other and consciously work to construct a new world that is just and equitable for all. It therefore should become part of the revision of multicultural policies and curriculum in Taiwan.

References

Andreotti, V. (2011). *Actionable postcolonial theory in education*. New York, USA: Palgrave Macmillan.

Banks, J. A. (1989). Approaches to multicultural curriculum reform. *Trotter Review, 3*(3), 17–19.

Caldwell, E. (2018). Transitional justice legislation in Taiwan before and during the Tsai administration. *Washington International Law Journal, 27*(2).

Cauquelin, J. (2011). *The aborigines of Taiwan. The Puyuma: From headhunting to the modern world* (2nd ed.). London/New York: Routledge.

Chen, P. (2012). Empowering identity reconstruction of Indigenous college students through transformative learning. *Educational Review, 64*(2), 161–180. doi:10.1080/00131911.2011.592574

Chen, S.-H. (2015). Promoting international education for Indigenous elementary schools in Taiwan: School principals' perspectives. *Asian Social Science, 11*(9). doi:10.5539/ass.v11n9p21

Chen, S.-M., & Young, A. L. (2015). Dancing with ethnic identities: An aboriginal dance club in a Taiwanese middle school. *International Journal of Multicultural Education, 17*(2).

Cheng, S. Y. (2004). *The politics of identity and schooling: A comparative case study of American Indians and Taiwan Aborigines (China).* (PhD), University of California, Los Angeles. (AAT 3146619)

Chi, C.-C. (2007). The ideas and ideals of First Nations and their applications in Taiwan: A critical evaluation. *Taiwan International Studies Quarterly, 3*(2), 1-22.

Chi, C. C. (2012). *Indigenous movements and the making of multicultural Taiwan*. Taipei, Taiwan (R.O.C.): Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica.

Chou, H.-M. (2005). *Educating urban Indigenous students in Taiwan: Six teachers' perspectives* (PhD thesis). University of Maryland, USA.

Coca, N. (2013). Taiwan's culture revitalization efforts in action. *Cultural Survival Quarterly: Language and Cultures*. Cambridge, MA: Cultural Survival.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications.

Fenelon, J. V., & LeBeau D. (2006). Four directions for Indian education: Curriculum models for Lakota and Dakota teaching and learning. In I. Abu-Saad & D. Champagne (Eds.), *Indigenous education and empowerment: International perspectives* (pp. 21-68). Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.

Friedman, P. K. (2018). The hegemony of the local: Taiwanese multiculturalism and Indigenous identity politics. *Boundary 2, 45*(3), 79-105. doi:10.1215/01903659-6915593

Gao, P. (2001). *Minority, not minor*. Taipei, Taiwan (R.O.C.): Taiwan Today, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Giroux, H. (1995). Insurgent multiculturalism and the promise of pedagogy. In D. T. Goldberg (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: A critical reader* (pp. 325–343). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Gorski, P. (2016). Rethinking the role of "culture" in educational equity: From cultural competence to equity literacy. *Multicultural Perspectives, 18*(4), 221-226. doi:10.1080/15210960.2016.1228344

Hsieh, J. (2006). *Collective rights of Indigenous peoples: Identity-based movement of plain Indigenous in Taiwan*. New York/London: Routledge.

Huang, W.-D. (2007). *Indigenous students' negotiation of cultural differences: The construction of linguistic identities amongst Amis students in Taiwan*. Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, Institute of Education, University of London.

International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA), The. (2019*). The Indigenous world 2019.* Copenhagen, Denmark: The Author.

Jackson, L. (2014a). *Muslims and Islam in U.S. education: Reconsidering multiculturalism*. London/New York: Routledge.

Jackson, L. (2014b). Under construction: The development of multicultural curriculum in Hong Kong and Taiwan. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 23*(4), 885–893. doi:10.1007/s40299-014-0199-9

Kingsbury, B. (1998). "Indigenous peoples" in international law: A constructivist approach to the Asian controversy. In C. Erni (Ed.), *The concept of Indigenous peoples in Asia: A resource book* (pp. 103-158). Copenhagen/Chiang Mai: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA)/Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact Foundation (AIPP).

Ku, K.-h. (2012). Rights to recognition: Minorities and Indigenous politics in emerging Taiwan nationalism. In D. Blundell (Ed.), *Taiwan since martial law: Society, culture, politics, economy* (pp. 91-129). Shung Ye Museum of Formosan Aborigines, the University of California, Berkley, & National Taiwan University Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2003). Lies my teacher still tells. In G. Ladson-Billings (Ed.), *Critical race perspectives on social studies: The profession, policies, and curriculum* (pp. 1–11). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Law, W.-W. (2002). Education reform in Taiwan: A search for a 'national' identity through democratisation and Taiwanisation. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 32*(1), 61-81. doi:10.1080/03057920120116535

Lee, L., & Chen, P. (2014). Empowering Indigenous youth: Perspectives from a national service-learning program in Taiwan. *The International Indigenous Policy Journal, 5*(3). doi:10.18584/iipj.2014.5.3.4

Mao, C.-J. (1997). Constructing a new social identity: Taiwan's curricular reforms of the nineties. *International Journal of Educational Reform, 6*(4), 400-406.

Mason, R. (2009). Problematising multicultural art education in the context of Taiwan. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 39*(4), 455-468. doi:10.1080/03057920802366364

May, S. (1999). Critical multiculturalism and cultural difference: Avoiding essentialism. In S. May (Ed.), *Critical multiculturalism: Rethinking multicultural and antiracist education* (pp. 11–41). Philadelphia/London: Falmer Press.

Morris, A. (2007). *Kanō baseball and 'triethnic' identity in 1930s Taiwan.* Paper presented at the Conference of the Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California Berkeley.

Munsterhjelm, M. (2002). The First Nations of Taiwan: A special report on Taiwan's Indigenous peoples. *Cultural Survival Quarterly: Lands, Resources, and Environments.* Cambridge, MA: Cultural Survival.

Nesterova, Y. (2019). Teaching Indigenous children in Taiwan: Tensions, complexities, and opportunities. *Global Studies of Childhood, 9*(2), 156-166. doi:10.1177/2043619846349

Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

Nieto, S. (2005). Critical multicultural education and students' perspectives. In. S. May (Ed.), *Critical multiculturalism: Rethinking multicultural and anti-racist education* (pp. 209–235). London: Falmer Press.

Pawan, C. (2004). *Indigenous language education in Taiwan.* Paper presented at the 11th Annual Stabilizing Indigenous Languages Conference, University of California at Berkeley.

Rudolph, M. (2016). The quest for ethnic reclassification in multiculturalist Taiwan: The case of the Sakizaya. *Archiv Orientalni, 84*(2), 413-443.

Shih, C.-F. (2010). Academic colonialism and the struggle for Indigenous knowledge systems in Taiwan. *Social Alternatives, 29*(1), 44-47.

Simon, S. (2002). The underside of a miracle: Industrialization, land, and Taiwan's Indigenous peoples. *Cultural Survival Quarterly: Lands, Resources, and Environments.* Cambridge, MA: Cultural Survival.

St. Denis, V. (2011). Silencing aboriginal curricular content and perspectives through multiculturalism: "There are other children here". *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 33*(4), 306-317. doi:10.1080/10714413.2011.597638

Su, Y.-C. (2006). Political ideology and Taiwanese school curricula. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 7*(1), 41-50. doi:10.1007/BF03036783

Su, Y.-C. (2007). Ideological representations of Taiwan's history: An analysis of elementary social studies textbooks, 1978–1995. *Curriculum Inquiry, 37*(3), 205-237. doi:10.1111/j.1467-873X.2007.00383.x

Teng, E. J. (2004). *Taiwan's imagined geography: Chinese colonial travel writing and pictures, 1683-1895.* Cambridge (Massachusetts)/London: Harvard University Asia Center.

Tsao, F.-f. (1997). Preserving Taiwan's Indigenous languages and cultures: A discussion in sociolinguistic perspective. *Globalization and Indigenous Culture*. Retrieved from http://www2.kokugakuin.ac.jp/ijcc/wp/global/07tsao.html

Ukpokodu, O. (2003). Teaching multicultural education from a critical perspective: Challenges and dilemmas. *Multicultural Perspectives, 5*(4), 17–23.

Wang, L.-j. (2004). Multiculturalism in Taiwan: Contradictions and challenges in cultural policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy, 10*(3), 301-318. doi:10.1080/1028663042000312534

Yen, S.-H. (2009). Effective strategies for teaching Taiwanese minority students with low achievement and low socio-economic backgrounds. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 10*, 455–463. doi:10.1007/s12564-009-9053-9

Zilliacus, H., Holm, G. & Sahlström, F. (2017). Taking steps towards institutionalising multicultural education: The national curriculum of Finland. *Multicultural Education Review, 9*(4), 231-248. doi:10.1080/2005615X.2017.1383810